

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

PETER JOHN MACIAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civ. No. 25-166 SCY

C.C.A.D.C.,¹ FNU CORDOVA, FNU COLE,
FNU STEINFELD, FNU MORENO, FNU
MENDOZA and FNU GONZALES,

Defendants.

ORDER REGARDING ADDRESSES FOR SERVICE

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff's Amended Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Doc. 1, filed February 18, 2025 ("Amended Complaint").²

Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. *See* Order, Doc. 6, filed February 24, 2026. Section 1915 provides that the "officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in [proceedings *in forma pauperis*]").

28 U.S.C. § 1915(d). The Court previously advised Plaintiff that "The Complaint fails to state a claim against the CCADC pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because there are no allegations showing

¹ "C.C.A.D.C." appears to refer to the Curry County Adult Detention Center. *See* Doc. 4 at 1, filed February 18, 2025.

² Plaintiff filed his original Complaint on February 18, 2025. *See* Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Doc. 1, filed February 18, 2025. The Court notified Plaintiff that the original Complaint failed to state claims against Defendants C.C.A.D.C. and Gonzales and ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint. *See* Doc. 6, filed February 24, 2025. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint contains allegations regarding Defendants C.C.A.D.C. and Gonzales but does not contain allegations regarding the other Defendants. *See* Amended Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Doc. 7, filed February 27, 2025 ("Amended Complaint"). The Court construes the Amended Complaint as incorporating the original Complaint by reference because the Amended Complaint states: "this is an ammended [sic] complaint to be added to original complain[t]." Amended Complaint at 2.

that the CCADC is a separate, suable entity.” Doc. 6 at 3. The Amended Complaint does not allege that CCADC is a suable entity. Doc. 7. Therefore, the Court does not order service on CCADC at this time.

The Court will order service on the individual defendants if Plaintiff provides the individual Defendants’ addresses for service.

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff shall, within 21 days of entry of this Order, file a notice that provides the service addresses for Defendants Cordova, Cole, Steinfield, Mendoza and Gonzales. Failure to timely provide the address for each individual Defendant may result in dismissal of claims against those Defendants.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE